09-23.08

PTO/SB/21 (11-07)
Approved for use through 11/30/2007. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) Total Number of Pages in This Submission			Application Number		10/810,452		
			Filing Date		March 26	March 26, 2004	
			First Named Inventor		Sehat Su	Sehat Sutardja	
			Art Unit		2838	2838	
			Examiner Name		Bao Q. Vu		
			Attorney Docket Number		MP0467	MP0467	
		ENCLOS	SURES (check all 1	that apply)		
Fee Transmittal Form		Drawing(s)				After Allowance Communication to Technology Center (TC)	
Fee Attached		Licensing-related Papers				Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences	
Amendment / Reply		Petition			Appeal (Appea	Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)	
After Final		Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application			Proprie	Proprietary Information	
Affidavits/declaration(s)		Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address			☐ Status	Status Letter	
Extension of Time Request		Terminal Disclaimer				Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):	
Express Abandonment Request		Request for Refund			Re	turn Receipt Postcard.	
Express Abandonment Nequest		CD, Number of CD(s)					
Information Disclosure Statement						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)		Remarks The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 08-0750. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.					
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application		. ,,					
Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53							
	SIGNAT	TURE OF A	PPLICANT, ATT	ORNEY,	OR AGENT		
Firm Name	Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.						
Signature	Mule 8 Home						
Printed name							
Date	September 22, 2008		Reg. No.	34,754			
	CE	RTIFICATI	E OF TRANSMIS	SION/MA	AILING		$\overline{}$
Service with sufficient	this correspondence is nt postage as first cl 3-1450 on the date sho	lass mail in	mile transmitted to an envelope addre	the USPT essed to:	O or deposited Commissioner	with the United States Pos for Patents, P.O. Box 145	ital 50,
Typed or printed nam	ermyer	er			EM 184 988 725 US (9/22/2008)		
Signature Rachael C			Nesman		Date	September 22, 2008	
This collection of informati						the term of the term	

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.:

10/810,452

Filing Date:

03/26/2004

Applicant:

Sehat Sutardja

Group Art Unit:

2838

Examiner:

Bao Q. Vu

Title:

VOLTAGE REGULATOR

Attorney Docket:

MP0467

BRIEF IN REPLY TO THE EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This reply brief is in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed July 21, 2008, in the Appeal from the decision of the Patent Examiner dated October 19, 2007, rejecting Claims 1, 4-11 and 14-29, which are reproduced as an Appendix to this Appeal Brief.

REPLY ARGUMENTS

With respect to Claim 1, both Qian and Lu fail to show, teach or suggest a coupled inductor having first and second windings, wherein the first winding and the second winding have a coefficient of coupling that is greater than or equal to 0.99. Further, the Qian reference teaches away from using a tightly coupled inductor and instead addresses the situation where the coupled inductors have a significant leakage inductance (represented by L_k) that causes high voltage spikes across the switches. The Examiner admits that Lu does not address this issue.

As shown in prior art FIG. 2 of Qian, the voltage swing that occurs as a result of the leakage inductance L_k appears to support the idea that while the inductors of Qian may be coupled, they are not tightly coupled in a manner as claimed. Furthermore, the switch S1 in prior art FIG. 2 of Qian must be able to withstand 160% of the input voltage rather than merely the input voltage as in Applicant's voltage regulator. The circuit in FIG. 4 of Qian uses all of the elements of the prior art circuit of FIG. 2 – including the coupled inductors with leakage inductance L_k . Therefore the description of FIG. 2 is equally applicable to FIG. 4. There is no discussion in Qian that the coupled inductors in FIG. 4 are different than those in the prior art circuit of FIG. 2.

Accordingly, the entire purpose of the improvement of Qian is to add the additional components to the prior art circuit of FIG. 2 to compensate for the leakage inductance L_k and to handle the voltage spikes that arise in the prior art circuit of FIG. 2. As described above, Qian is directed to solving problems associated with coupled inductors having significant leakage inductance and thus teaches away from the use of coupled inductors with the claimed coefficient of coupling.

In response, the Examiner maintains that "one of ordinary skill in the art would also know that Qian at the time of the invention could not achieve perfect coupling so the circuit of figure 4 was used to compensate for the leakage inductance and therefore the circuit S3 and Cr was added to cure this problem," and therefore "the circuit of S3 and Cr would not be needed." (See Page 11, Lines 7-12 of the Examiner's Answer). In other words, the Examiner appears to be alleging that one skilled in the art would

modify Qian with the teachings of Lu instead of <u>providing the improvements that the Qian reference fairly teaches.</u>

Here again, Lu appears to be absent of any teaching or suggestion of addressing the problem that Qian is directed to, and Qian already provides a solution in the form of the additional structure discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant again respectfully submits that one skilled in the art presented with Qian, which already solves the problem of the leakage inductance, would have no motivation whatsoever to look to the teachings of Lu for the alleged alternate solution.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons presented above, the rejections of the claims are not properly founded and should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

Date: September 22, 2008

Michael D. Wigdins

Registration No. 34,754

Damian M. Aquino Registration No. 54,964 Attorneys for Appellants

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. Box 828 Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303 (248) 641-1600